

REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,604 to Yamazaki et al. ("Yamazaki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,569 to Matsuzaki et al. ("Matsuzaki").

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 5, 11, 15, 19 and 24 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter. Support for these amendments can be found at page 38, lines 16-19; page 40, lines 17-19; page 41, lines 22-25; page 42, lines 5-7; page 46, lines 11-12 and 23-25; page 47, lines 8-10 and 21-22; and page 48, lines 16-17.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Matsuzaki, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Yamazaki shows a process for operating a laptop computer where a sleep mode is entered after a predetermined period of inactivity. A timer is set to an initial value (72). A check is then made to determine if either keyboard activity has occurred (73) or video activity has occurred (75). If so, the timer is reset (74). If not, the timer is incremented (76). If the timer is greater than a specified value, the sleep or standby mode is entered (78). If not, the process loops back to check for keyboard or video activity.

Matsuzaki shows the use of ferro-electric liquid crystal displays (FLCD). These displays have the property of maintaining their state after power is removed (col. 1, lines 45-56). Because the display will be maintained at power-off, Matsuzaki shows a

process for erasing the display when a power-off command has been received (col. 5, line 62 – col. 6., line 29).

In contrast to the cited references, claim 1 includes:

a controller which, in response to a command to turn off the electric power source which is issued while the display is performing writing of an image based on display data by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, turns off the electric power source after completion of the writing of the image which is being written on the display based on the display data when the command to turn off the electric power source is issued;

whereby the display displays a complete image based on display data after the electric power source has been turned off.

Matsuzaki shows a process of erasing the display in response to a power-off command. Neither of the cited references shows or suggests completing the image being written when a command to turn off the device is entered while writing of the image is in progress. To support a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the combined references must show or suggest every limitation of the claim. MPEP §2143.03. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claim 1 and claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Claims 2-4 are dependent upon claim 1 and thus include every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claims 2-4 and claims 2-4 are also patentably distinct from the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 5 includes:

a delay process which, when the display is performing writing of an image based on display data by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, delays execution of the automatic power-off process so that the electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing of the image which is being written on the display based on the display data at the time of executing the automatic power off process;

whereby the display displays a complete image based on display data after the electric power source has been turned off.

As noted above, neither of the cited references shows or suggests completing the image being written when a command to turn off the device occurs while writing of the image is in progress. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claim 5 and claim 5 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Claims 6-10 are dependent upon claim 5 and thus include every limitation of claim 5. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claims 6-10 and claims 6-10 are also patentably distinct from the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 11 includes:

a controller which, when the first input member is operated while writing of an image based on display data on the display is being performed, invalidates the command sent from the first input member and, when the first input member is operated after completion of the writing of an image based on display data, controls the electronic information device in accordance with the command sent from the first input member;
whereby when the first input member is operated during writing of an image based on display data on the display, the display completely displays the image which was being written based on the display data when the first input member was operated after an electric power source supplying power to the display has been turned off.

As noted above, neither of the cited references shows or suggests completing the image being written when a command to turn off the device is entered using an input member while writing of the image is in progress. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claim 11 and claim 11 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Claims 12-14 are dependent upon claim 11 and thus include every limitation of claim 11. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claims 12-14 and claims 12-14 are also patentably distinct from the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 15 includes:

when a power-off of the electric power source is commanded while the display is performing writing of an image based on display data by

consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, executing the power-off command after completion of the writing of the image which is being written on the display based on the display data when the power off of the electric power source is commanded;

whereby when the power off of the electric power source is commanded while the display is performing writing of an image based on display data, the display displays a complete image based on display data after the electric power source has been turned off.

As noted above, neither of the cited references shows or suggests completing the image being written when a command to turn off the device is entered while writing of the image is in progress. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claim 15 and claim 15 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Claims 16-18 are dependent upon claim 15 and thus include every limitation of claim 15. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claims 16-18 and claims 16-18 are also patentably distinct from the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 19 includes:

a delay step of, when writing of an image based on display data on the display is being performed, delaying execution of the power-off step so that the electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing of the image which is being written on the display based on the display data at the time of executing the automatic power off process;

whereby the display displays a complete image based on display data after the electric power source has been turned off.

As noted above, neither of the cited references shows or suggests completing the image being written when a command to turn off the device is entered while writing of the image is in progress. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claim 19 and claim 19 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Claims 20-23 are dependent upon claim 19 and thus include every limitation of claim 19. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claims 20-23 and claims 20-23 are also patentably distinct from the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 24 includes:

when the first input member is operated while writing of an image based on display data on the display is being performed, invalidating the command sent from the first input member, and, when the first input member is operated after completion of the writing of an image based on display data, controlling the electronic information device in accordance with the command sent from the first input member;

whereby when the first input member is operated during writing of an image based on display data on the display, the display completely displays the image which was being written based on the display data when the first input member was operated after the electric power source has been turned off.

As noted above, neither of the cited references shows or suggests invalidating a command until completing the image being written on a display, while allowing the command after writing the image is complete. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claim 24 and claim 24 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Claims 25-29 are dependent upon claim 24 and thus include every limitation of claim 24. Therefore, the cited references do not support a *prima facie* case for obviousness of claims 25-29 and claims 25-29 are also patentably distinct from the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Matsuzaki, is respectfully traversed based on the following, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 09/527,350
Amendment dated April 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2006


This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Douglas A. Sorensen
Registration No. 31,570
Attorney for Applicants

DAS/fis:bar
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3482
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
April 18, 2006